

Multiple Measures of Teacher Effectiveness in Hillsborough County Public Schools: The Role of Principals

In the spring of 2009, when the leaders in Hillsborough County Public Schools (HCPS) in Tampa, FL embarked on an ambitious plan to change teacher evaluation, they knew the role and evaluations of school principals would also have to be transformed. The new teacher evaluation required principals to spend much more time in the classroom observing and analyzing instruction. But, the old principal's evaluation relied on a vague checklist of school leadership standards that were difficult to link to specific professional development. Moreover, the principals' evaluation considered only one person's perspective, had minimal variation, and was weakly correlated with student achievement. Through a collaborative process led by Superintendent MaryEllen Elia and Hillsborough Classroom Teachers Association President Jean Clements, the district concurrently crafted new teachers' and principals' evaluations that included multiple measures of effectiveness and reinforced each other's key components. The goals were to continue to emphasize the principal as an instructional leader and give principals the tools they needed to evaluate and guide teachers' instruction.

The new teacher evaluation incorporated student achievement data using value-added measures (40 percent), peer evaluator evaluation (30 percent), and principal evaluation (30 percent) to provide a more complete picture of a teacher's impact on student learning. As a major component of the initiative, HCPS also adopted a classroom observation rubric to be used by peers and principals that encouraged reflective practice, offered actionable feedback, and integrated pre- and post-observation conferences. Principals were now expected to conduct at least one observation cycle (pre-observation, observation, and post-observation) with every teacher in their school. Principals then analyzed their formal observational data with findings from informal classroom "pop-ins" and the peer evaluator's observations to determine their 30-percent part of a teacher's final evaluation.

The new system shifted the way principals spent their time in schools. Previously, principals observed tenured teachers once every three years; only non-tenured teachers were observed every year. To reflect this change in expectations, the principals' evaluation was revised. Two former principals, two area directors, two district administrators, three principals and three teachers came together as the Principals' Evaluation Committee to create an evaluation that incorporated multiple measures of effectiveness. The result was a multi-dimensional evaluation based on student achievement data (40 percent), teacher and supervisor input through a 360-degree survey (30 percent), and other factors (30 percent) such as school operations, student attendance, teacher retention, and evaluation of teachers.

The Principal as an Instructional Leader

With the new teacher evaluation, the commonly heard but rarely practiced refrain, "principal as instructional leader," rang true in HCPS. Principals now had daily conversations with teachers about their planning process, instructional strategies, and reflections on the effectiveness of a particular lesson. Most importantly, principals and teachers were increasingly working together to solve the

learning problems presented by individual students. The newly-adopted observation rubric, based on Charlotte Danielson's work, helped facilitate such dialogue. The instrument consisted of four domains covering 22 components of a teacher's work – from planning and preparation (Domain 1) to classroom environment (Domain 2) and instruction (Domain 3). A teacher's professional responsibilities, such as maintaining accurate records, communicating with families, participating in a learning community, and showing professionalism were represented in Domain 4. Principals assessed teachers on the components in each domain according to four performance ratings: Requires Action, Developing, Accomplished, and Exemplary (see **Figure 1** for an excerpt).

For principals, the Danielson rubric was a key element in helping teachers improve their practice. It offered an objective analysis of the complex interaction between teachers, students, and content. A principal commented: "When we go in to do our observations, we're not just in there observing what the teacher is doing. We're in there to observe what the students are doing and how they are engaged in the lesson. It's taken a different twist as to what you look for when you go into a room. It's not all about the teacher anymore. It's about how the students are being involved in their own education." Perhaps, more importantly, the rating scale meant principals could offer specific actionable feedback to teachers. A principal explained: "The other evaluation was somewhat vague. We didn't always have documentation about what we felt was the right score or the right category to put each teacher in. The new evaluation takes out the vagueness. The biggest difference is the evidence that we now can obtain by going in and using the Charlotte Danielson observation forms."

The evaluation instrument also required principals to meet with teachers before and after observations. Principals connected with teachers prior to the observation, either in person or electronically, to discuss the lesson's objectives, their alignment with state standards, data used to design the lesson, instructional strategies, and assessment. A pre-observation guide was designed to help principals ask targeted questions (see **Figure 2** for an excerpt). Principals then conducted the observation, which typically lasted the entire class session for middle and high school teachers or around 30 minutes for elementary school teachers. Within two or three days, the principal and teacher sat down to discuss the lesson in a post-observation conference. While the entire lesson would be debriefed in light of Domains 1, 2, and 3, principals paid particularly close attention to Domain 4a: Reflecting on Teaching in the post-conference. Teachers accomplished in this skill were able to offer an accurate and objective description of the lesson using specific evidence, and suggest ways to improve the lesson.

Of course, implementing such a comprehensive teacher evaluation system in every school in the district was not easy. Rigorous training and clear communication were essential. Principals received extensive training in the summer prior to the rollout of the system. In fact, principals were not allowed to conduct any observations until they were certified by the training firm, Cambridge Education. This ensured a high degree of inter-rater reliability between principals as it was essential that teachers believed their ratings would be consistent and fair across schools. A principal remarked on the rigor of the training: "We were trained on what to look for in each category, how to look for it, how to discuss it, and how to mark it on a teacher's evaluation. Training was very intensive." Area directors checked rater reliability throughout the year and if a principal was inflating (or deflating) ratings in a particular domain, he or she was retrained. In addition, HCPS offered online video trainings throughout the school year to address problematic rating trends found in the data.

Assessing Instructional Leadership

Asking principals to focus more on instruction in the classroom meant the district had to find a different way to evaluate the school leader's new role. The previous evaluation was more of a

checklist and not aligned with increased focus on teacher observation. Principals were rated one to four on ten competencies based on Florida's educational leadership standards. Those earning more than 32 points total received an outstanding rating; principals scoring 25 to 31 points were considered performing at a satisfactory level. Anyone earning fewer than 17 points was rated unsatisfactory and typically demoted to the position he or she last held. The ten competencies – vision, instructional leadership, managing the learning environment, community and stakeholder partnerships, human resource development, and ethical leadership, to name a few – were broad and vague in description. For example, principals exhibiting high performance in human resource development “...recruit, select, nurture, and, where appropriate, retain effective personnel, develop mentor and partnership programs, and design and implement comprehensive professional growth plans for all staff.” While HCPS had developed eight to twelve sample indicators for each standard, these lacked the specificity needed to objectively assess a principal's performance and offer tailored professional development.

Keeping these issues in mind, in the winter of 2010, the Principals' Evaluation Committee set out to craft an aligned evaluation that was rigorous, objective, and actionable. As a first step, the Committee established specific research-based guidelines for the new evaluation. It had to incorporate gains in student learning, a 360-degree component that included input from teachers and area directors, and components focused on the critical tasks of a principal's job. The group also wanted to explicitly link the evaluation process to ongoing principal professional development. By the early summer of 2010, the Committee had settled on eight evaluation components that heavily weighted student achievement. The eight components and their respective weightings were:

Percentage of Students Making Learning Gains (30 percent): At the end of each year, the district calculated a value-added measure for its students with help from the University of Wisconsin's Value-Added Research Center. The score indicated whether the student learned at a faster or slower rate than an average student with similar characteristics. Positive scores meant above average growth. For principals, the percentage of all students in their school making average or above average learning gains comprised 30 percent of their evaluation.

Percentage of Level 1 and 2 Students Making Learning Gains (10 percent): The evaluation placed special emphasis on the weakest students in a school. The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) established five levels of student achievement in reading and math. Students scoring at the lowest levels – Level 1 and 2 – were not meeting the minimum levels on the state standards. Ten percent of the principal's evaluation incorporated learning gains from students scoring at Levels 1 and 2 on the FCAT.

360-Degree Teacher Assessment (15 percent): HCPS used the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED) 360-degree survey to gather teacher input on principal performance. Pilot tested in 225 schools at the end of the 2009-2010 school year, the VAL-ED was a research-based assessment of principals' behaviors that linked directly to teacher performance and student learning. All teachers in a school rated their principal on a scale of one (ineffective) to five (outstandingly effective) in six core areas: high standards for student learning, rigorous curriculum, quality instruction, culture of learning and professional behavior, performance accountability, and connections to external communities. Each area encompassed twelve questions that focused on six common processes: planning, implementing, supporting, advocating, communicating, and monitoring. Teachers were expected to cite evidence for their ratings (see **Figure 3** for sample questions and format). Vanderbilt University then analyzed the survey results and produced a detailed report that included a principal's overall effectiveness score, core component scores, and key process scores (see **Figure 4** for sample summary scores). The report also had a helpful chart for planning professional development that color-coded areas of need (see **Figure 5** for sample chart).

Area Director Assessment (15 percent): The Area Director also filled out the VAL-ED survey for his or her 15 percent contribution to the evaluation and Vanderbilt generated a report detailing a principal's strengths and weaknesses. Thus, principals could look for trends across the teachers' and Area Director's evaluations and identify common areas of development. It is important to note that the VAL-ED survey was not the only place Area Directors had input on principals' performance. They also played roles in setting expectations for school operations, teacher retention, and student attendance.

School Operations (10 percent): The district used audit data to assess principals' performance in school operations. Principals could earn up to 10 points across six key operational areas. Internal accounts, property control, and staffing allocation were worth two points each. Human resources and student nutrition accounted for one point each. Finally, principals' management of payroll, textbooks, and reimbursements was collectively two points. The central office departments responsible for each operational task determined the scoring metric used to assign points. For example, if principals submitted their payroll forms with less than three reminders per fiscal year, they could earn a point in that area. Under special circumstances, Area Directors could adjust a principal's score, but the change had to be discussed with all the Area Directors beforehand. In addition, new principals were not penalized for decisions made by the former principal that impacted operations in the following school year.

Student Attendance/Discipline (10 percent): Area Directors set the student attendance (5 percent) and discipline (5 percent) benchmarks used to assign scores to principals. For student attendance, schools were segmented by school level and type. Elementary, middle, and high schools were compared with each other based on whether they were a Renaissance (greater than 90 percent free/reduced lunch), Title I (greater than 60 percent free/reduced lunch), or traditional school. For example, distinct attendance targets were set for elementary Renaissance schools (93.7 percent) vs. elementary traditional schools (96.0 percent). Principals hitting their attendance targets could earn five percentage points. Area Directors also determined the discipline scores. Using due process reports, discipline reports, parent calls, and cite visits, Area Directors worked together to assign principals either 0, 2.5, or 5 points. Area Directors' scores were compared to ensure similar score distributions.

Teacher Retention (5 percent): Principals' performance in teacher retention was determined using a similar process as student attendance. Similar level and type schools were segmented into tiers and ranked based on the percentage of high-performing teachers retained. Area Directors then assigned points to each tier. Once a principal accumulated three years of retention data, a rolling three-year average was used for the ranking process.

Teacher Evaluation (5 percent): Another five percent of a principal's evaluation was based on the accuracy of his or her teacher evaluations when compared to those of peer evaluators and teachers' value-added scores. The principal-peer evaluation comparison drove half of the total score, while the value-added comparison accounted for the remaining 50 percent. An r-squared statistic – a measure of how well an estimated regression line fits observed data points – was generated for each comparison. Area Directors then set r-squared score thresholds to assign points.

Connecting Evaluation to Professional Development

One of the most important features of the new evaluation was its ability to identify specific areas of improvement. Area Directors were then able to target district support and professional development based on individual principal needs. HCPS had already developed three key training strands aligned with the new evaluation: instructional leader, human resource manager, and

The Role of Principals

manager of learning environment. Courses and other professional development activities, such as small group meetings and focus groups, were designed under each topic. Area Directors could then prescribe a particular course or activity or the principal could choose one on his or her own. HCPS also used retired principals as coaches. Area Directors could identify a particular need and request a coach to work with the principal. In addition, HCPS used principal recruitment and training programs such as its Urban Leader Institute and Preparing New Principal Program to ensure the district had a pipeline of prepared school leaders. Overall, many principals were impressed by the level of professional development offered in HCPS when compared to their colleagues in other districts. As one principal said: "A principal really and truly gets a lot of professional development in this county. And kudos to the professional development team. We are never short on professional development activities."

Adapting to Change

The 2010-2011 school year marked the first year using the new principals' and teachers' evaluations. Eventually, the evaluations would be tied to compensation, but for now, the district was working hard to communicate change and fix kinks in implementation. The new teacher evaluation had dramatically changed the job of principals in the district. Principals now spent a majority of their time observing and analyzing instruction, and reflecting with teachers on how to improve student learning. The change was significant and principals were still adjusting to the new role. A particular challenge was developing the time management skills necessary to conduct observations on all teachers, while carrying out other duties. But, most saw the increased emphasis on instructional leadership as a move in the right direction for students in HCPS. As one principal concluded: "The only way you can move academic achievement is through feedback to teachers."

Figure 1: Excerpt from Observation Rubric Used by HCPS

| Performance rating | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Requires Action <i>(0 points)</i> | Developing <i>(1 points)</i> | Accomplished <i>(2 points)</i> | Exemplary <i>(3 points)</i> |
| Domain 1: Planning and Preparation <i>(Domain weight: 20%)</i> | | | | |
| 1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy (Component weight: 4%) | The teacher's <u>plans and practice</u> display little knowledge of the <u>content</u> , prerequisite relationships between different aspects of the content, or the <u>instructional practices</u> specific to that discipline. | The teacher's <u>plans and practice</u> reflect some awareness of the <u>important concepts in the discipline</u> , prerequisite relationships between them, and the <u>instructional practices</u> specific to that discipline. | The teacher's <u>plans and practice</u> reflect solid knowledge of the <u>content</u> , prerequisite relationships between important concepts, and the <u>instructional practices</u> specific to that discipline. | The teacher's <u>plans and practice</u> reflect <u>extensive knowledge of the content</u> , the structure of the discipline and <u>instructional practices</u> . The teacher actively builds on knowledge of prerequisites and misconceptions when describing instruction or seeking causes for student misunderstanding. The teacher stays abreast of emerging research areas, new and innovative methods and incorporates them into lesson plans and instructional strategies. |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Elements include:</i> Knowledge of content and the structure of the discipline Knowledge of prerequisite relationships Knowledge of content-related pedagogy | | | | |
| 1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (Component weight: 4%) | The teacher demonstrates little or no knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, learning levels / styles, language proficiencies, interests, and special needs, and does not seek such understanding. | The teacher indicates the importance of understanding students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, learning levels / styles, language proficiencies, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for the class as a whole. | The teacher actively seeks knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, learning levels / styles, language proficiencies, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for groups of students. | The teacher actively seeks knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, learning levels / styles, language proficiencies, interests, and special needs from a variety of sources, and attains this knowledge of individual students. |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>Elements include:</i> Knowledge of child and adolescent development Knowledge of the learning process Knowledge of students' skills, knowledge, and language proficiency Knowledge of students' interests and cultural heritage Knowledge of students' special needs | | | | |

Source: Internal Hillsborough County Public Schools Document

Figure 2: Pre-observation Conference Guide Excerpt

| Learning Goals and Objectives |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. What is/are your lesson objective(s)? (<i>Components 1A, 1C</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Why did you choose these goal(s) and objective(s)?</i>• <i>Where are you in relation to presenting this initial content and mastery?</i>• <i>How do you plan to communicate the learning objective to the students?</i>• <i>How are you segmenting the learning?</i>• <i>How much time are you spending on these goal(s) and objective(s)?</i> |
| 2. How is/are the lesson objective(s) aligned with state curriculum standards? (1A, 1C) |
| 3. What data did you use to design this lesson? How did the data influence the planning of this lesson? (1B, 1C, 1F) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>What kind of background knowledge do the students need to have for this lesson?</i>• <i>What sources of student data did you use to determine student performance levels?</i>• <i>How do you become familiar with students' background knowledge, skill levels, experiences, and cultural resources?</i>• <i>Why are these concepts and habits appropriate to the students' learning needs?</i>• <i>What difficulties or misunderstandings might students have? How have you planned for those?</i>• <i>What are some of the ways that you will make the learning relevant to students?</i> |
| Assessment |
| 4. How will you know if your lesson objective(s) was/were achieved? (1F) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>How do you plan to provide feedback to the students?</i>• <i>How will the students be assessed by both the teacher and by the students themselves?</i>• <i>How will accomplishment be recognized?</i>• <i>Where have you built in time for student reflection and self-assessment in your lesson?</i>• <i>What are some of the questions you plan to ask students during the lesson?</i>• <i>How do you expect students to respond to questions—whole class? Individual?</i>• <i>How do you ensure that you call on all students?</i>• <i>Are there opportunities in the lesson for students to generate questions that would encourage them to think?</i> |

Source: Internal Hillsborough County Public Schools Document

Figure 3: Teacher VAL-Ed Excerpt

| Quality Instruction (pedagogy) - There are effective instructional practices that maximize student academic and social learning. | | Sources of Evidence Check Key Sources of Evidence | | | | | | Effectiveness Rating Mark One Circle to Indicate How Effective or Check DK | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | Reports from Others | Personal Observations | School Documents | School Projects or Activities | Other Sources | No Evidence | Ineffective | Minimally Effective | Satisfactorily Effective | Highly Effective | Outstandingly Effective | Don't Know |
| How effective is the principal at ensuring the school... | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Planning | 25. plans instructional services for students with special needs using assessment data. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |
| | 26. plans a schedule that enables quality instruction. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |
| Implementing | 27. coordinates efforts to improve instruction in all classes. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |
| | 28. recruits teachers with the expertise to deliver instruction that maximizes student learning. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |
| Supporting | 29. supports collaboration among faculty to improve instruction that maximizes student learning. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |
| | 30. supports teachers' opportunities to improve their instructional practices. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |
| Advocating | 31. advocates for all students to regularly experience effective instruction. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |
| | 32. advocates opportunities for high quality instruction beyond the regular school day and school year. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |
| Communicating | 33. discusses instructional practices during faculty meetings. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |
| | 34. communicates with faculty about removing barriers that prevent students from experiencing quality instruction. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |
| Monitoring | 35. evaluates how instructional time is used. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |
| | 36. evaluates teachers' instructional practices. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="radio"/> 1 | <input type="radio"/> 2 | <input type="radio"/> 3 | <input type="radio"/> 4 | <input type="radio"/> 5 | <input type="radio"/> DK |

Source: Vanderbilt University, VAL-ED Survey.

Figure 4: Sample Summary Scores from VAL-ED Survey

| Overall Effectiveness Score | | | |
|------------------------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|
| Mean Score | Performance Level | | Percentile Rank |
| 3.47 | Basic | | 31.9 |
| The standard error of measurement is .05 | | | |

| Summary of Core Components Scores | | | | Summary of Key Processes Scores | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | Mean | Performance Level | Percentile Rank | | Mean | Performance Level | Percentile Rank |
| High Standards for Student Learning | 3.53 | Basic | 34.6 | Planning | 3.47 | Basic | 37.8 |
| Rigorous Curriculum | 3.53 | Basic | 44.2 | Implementing | 3.35 | Basic | 20.9 |
| Quality Instruction | 3.69 | Proficient | 50.6 | Supporting | 3.64 | Proficient | 38.7 |
| Culture of Learning & Professional Behavior | 3.48 | Basic | 22.8 | Advocating | 3.42 | Basic | 36.0 |
| Connections to External Communities | 3.04 | Below Basic | 15.9 | Communicating | 3.49 | Basic | 33.3 |
| Performance Accountability | 3.40 | Basic | 41.0 | Monitoring | 3.45 | Basic | 37.8 |

Source: Discovery Education, VAL-ED Sample Report, Retrieved from <http://www.discoveryeducation.com/administrators/assessment/val-ed>

Figure 5: Sample Summary Scores from VAL-ED Survey

- Cells that are green represent areas of behavior that are 'proficient' or 'distinguished' (P).
- Cells that are yellow represent areas of behavior that are 'basic' (B).
- Cells that are red represent areas of behavior that are 'below basic' (BB).

| Core Components | Key Processes | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|
| | Planning | Implementing | Supporting | Advocating | Communicating | Monitoring |
| High Standards for Student Learning | B | B | P | BB | P | B |
| Rigorous Curriculum | B | BB | P | P | BB | B |
| Quality Instruction | B | P | P | B | P | P |
| Culture of Learning & Professional Behavior | P | B | B | P | B | BB |
| Connections to External Communities | BB | BB | BB | BB | BB | BB |
| Performance Accountability | B | BB | P | BB | B | B |

Source: Discovery Education, VAL-ED Sample Report, Retrieved from <http://www.discoveryeducation.com/administrators/assessment/val-ed>